

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in the application. Claims 1-55 stand rejected. Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 42, and 54 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims and consideration of the following remarks.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 13-14, 16, 18-20, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,157,648 (Voit). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.


Amended claim 1 now requires that the second link does not include the first user communication device and that the first link does not include the second user communication device. Thus, in claim 1 the first user communication device is in communication with the service provider over the first link, which does not include the second user communication device. In addition, the second user communication device is in communication with the service provider over the second link, which does not include the first user communication device. Lastly, after the additional bandwidth request, the second user communication device communicates with the service provider over the second link and a third link that connects the second user communication device and the first user communication device.

In contrast, Voit discloses a telephone 112 linked to an Internet Telephony Gateway (ITG) 118, and further linked to the Internet 106. The link between the telephone 112 and the ITG 118 is a first link. The link between the ITG 118 and the Internet is a second link. The resulting link between the telephone 112 and the Internet is a third link. However, the first link, the second link, and the third link all include the ITG 118, as opposed to claim 1 which requires that the first link not include the second user communication device and that the second link not include the first user communication device.

The remaining independent claims contain limitations similar to those of independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims. A discussion of the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is obviated in view of the discussion distinguishing Voit.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests their allowance. Any fees in addition to those submitted may be charged to Deposit Account No. 210765.

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176
Setter Ollila LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:**CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100